

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 383, noes 18, answered “present” 1, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

AYES—383

Abercrombie	DeGette	Jones (OH)
Aderholt	DeLauro	Kanjorski
Allen	DeMint	Kaptur
Andrews	Diaz-Balart	Kelly
Archer	Dickey	Kennedy
Army	Dixon	Kildee
Bachus	Doggett	Kilpatrick
Baird	Dooley	Kind (WI)
Baker	Doolittle	King (NY)
Baldacci	Doyle	Kingston
Baldwin	Dreier	Kleczka
Ballenger	Duncan	Klink
Barcia	Dunn	Knollenberg
Barr	Edwards	Kolbe
Barrett (NE)	Ehlers	Kuykendall
Barrett (WI)	Ehrlich	LaFalce
Bartlett	Emerson	LaHood
Barton	Engel	Lampson
Bass	English	Lantos
Bateman	Eshoo	Largent
Becerra	Etheridge	Larson
Bentsen	Evans	Latham
Bereuter	Everett	LaTourette
Berkley	Fattah	Lazio
Berman	Fletcher	Leach
Berry	Foley	Lee
Biggert	Forbes	Levin
Bilbray	Ford	Lewis (GA)
Bilirakis	Fossella	Lewis (KY)
Bishop	Fowler	Linder
Blagojevich	Franks (NJ)	Lipinski
Bliley	Frelinghuysen	Loftgren
Blumenauer	Frost	Lowe
Boehlert	Gallegly	Lucas (KY)
Boehner	Ganske	Lucas (OK)
Bonilla	Gekas	Luther
Bonior	Gephardt	Maloney (CT)
Bono	Gilchrest	Maloney (NY)
Borski	Gillmor	Manzullo
Boswell	Gilman	Markey
Boucher	Goode	Martinez
Boyd	Goodlatte	Mascara
Brady (PA)	Goodling	Matsui
Brady (TX)	Gordon	McCarthy (MO)
Brown (CA)	Goss	McCarthy (NY)
Brown (FL)	Green (TX)	McCollum
Brown (OH)	Green (WI)	McCrery
Bryant	Greenwood	McGovern
Burr	Gutknecht	McHugh
Buyer	Hall (OH)	McInnis
Callahan	Hansen	McIntosh
Calvert	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Camp	Hastings (WA)	McKeon
Campbell	Hayes	McKinney
Canady	Hayworth	McNulty
Cannon	Herger	Meehan
Capps	Hill (IN)	Meek (FL)
Capuano	Hill (MT)	Meeks (NY)
Cardin	Hilleary	Menendez
Castle	Hinches	Metcalfe
Chabot	Hinojosa	Mica
Chambliss	Hobson	Millender-McDonald
Chenoweth	Hoeffel	Miller (FL)
Clay	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary
Clayton	Holden	Miller, George
Clement	Holt	Minge
Clyburn	Hooley	Mink
Coble	Horn	Moakley
Coburn	Hostettler	Mollohan
Collins	Houghton	Moore
Combest	Hoyer	Moran (VA)
Condit	Hulshof	Morella
Cook	Hunter	Murtha
Costello	Hutchinson	Myrick
Cox	Hyde	Nadler
Coyne	Inslee	Napolitano
Cramer	Istook	Neal
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Nethercutt
Cubin	Jackson-Lee	Ney
Cummings	(TX)	Northup
Cunningham	Jefferson	Norwood
Danner	Jenkins	Nussle
Davis (FL)	John	Obey
Davis (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Ortiz
Davis (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Ose
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Oxley
DeFazio	Jones (NC)	

Packard	Sawyer	Thomas
Pallone	Saxton	Thompson (CA)
Pascarella	Scarborough	Thompson (MS)
Pastor	Schakowsky	Thornberry
Paul	Scott	Thune
Payne	Sensenbrenner	Thurman
Pease	Serrano	Tiahrt
Pelosi	Sessions	Tierney
Peterson (MN)	Shadegg	Toomey
Peterson (PA)	Shaw	Towns
Petri	Shays	Trafficant
Phelps	Sherman	Turner
Pombo	Sherwood	Udall (CO)
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Udall (NM)
Porter	Shows	Upton
Portman	Shuster	Velazquez
Price (NC)	Simpson	Vento
Price (OH)	Sisisky	Visclosky
Quinn	Skelton	Walden
Rahall	Slaughter	Walsh
Rangel	Smith (MI)	Wamp
Regula	Smith (TX)	Watkins
Reyes	Smith (WA)	Watt (NC)
Reynolds	Snyder	Watts (OK)
Riley	Souder	Waxman
Rivers	Spratt	Weiner
Rodriguez	Stabenow	Weldon (FL)
Roemer	Stark	Weldon (PA)
Rogers	Stearns	Wexler
Rohrabacher	Stenholm	Weygand
Ros-Lehtinen	Strickland	Whitfield
Rothman	Stump	Wicker
Roukema	Stupak	Wilson
Roybal-Allard	Sununu	Wise
Royce	Sweeney	Wolf
Ryan (WI)	Talent	Woolsey
Ryun (KS)	Tancredo	Wu
Salmon	Tanner	Wynn
Sanchez	Tauscher	Young (AK)
Sanders	Tauzin	Young (FL)
Sandlin	Taylor (NC)	
Sanford	Terry	

NOES—18

Crane	LoBiondo	Ramstad
Filner	McDermott	Sabo
Gibbons	Moran (KS)	Schaffer
Hefley	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Hilliard	Olver	Waters
Kucinich	Pickett	Weller

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Carson

NOT VOTING—31

Ackerman	Farr	Owens
Blunt	Frank (MA)	Pickering
Burton	Gejdenson	Pitts
Conyers	Gonzalez	Radanovich
Cooksey	Graham	Rogan
Delahunt	Granger	Rush
DeLay	Gutierrez	Skeen
Deutscher	Hall (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Dicks	Kasich	Spence
Dingell	Lewis (CA)	
Ewing	Livingston	

□ 1241

Mr. LOBIONDO changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker. I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber on February 3, 1999, during rollcall vote Nos. 9, 10, and 11. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote No. 9, “yea” on rollcall vote No. 10, and “aye” on rollcall vote No. 11.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 393

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any reference to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) as a co-sponsor of H.R. 393, a bill to amend the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Con-

trol Act of 1978, to provide for the remediation of the Atlas uranium milling site near Moab, Utah, be deleted from the RECORD. His name was inadvertently included, and he has requested it be removed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I was detained the last 2 days by a violent abdominal illness and was not able to attend the session yesterday.

Had I been present, I would have voted in the affirmative on H.R. 68 and H.R. 432, rollcalls 7 and 8.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
*Washington, DC, February 2, 1999.*  
Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to advise you that due to my recent appointment to the House International Relations Committee, I regretfully relinquish my membership on the House Science Committee.

Please take appropriate action to effect this change.

Sincerely,

BARBARA LEE,  
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1245

#### INTRODUCTION OF GIVE FANS A CHANCE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, during the 25 years that I have been

privileged to work with communities across the country to help make them more livable, nothing has captured the imagination of the ordinary citizen more strongly than suggesting that our communities no longer be held hostage to the whims of billionaire sports team owners. The fact today is that a few dozen of America's richest people can decide for any reason at all that they are not making enough money, or they think they could make more money, or that they do not like the color of the stadium, or that perhaps they could squeeze more from the fans where they are by offering up the possibility that their team will be relocated somewhere else, perhaps to a town that some other owner has abandoned.

The bidding war with threats, implied or explicit, for taxpayers and fans to cough up millions more in subsidies to a franchise is a fact of life for fans in more than half of America's metropolitan areas. It has been a sad spectacle that started in the 1950s when the profitable Brooklyn Dodgers and their compatriots, the New York Giants, both baseball teams, left for greener pastures in California. This has triggered a parade of franchise relocation, many times not because of a lack of fan support or financial support but simply because the owners felt they could get a better deal elsewhere. Witness the recent sad situation of the long-suffering fans in Cleveland, Ohio, who have been in that icebox of a stadium year in and year out to capacity and now the Browns are gone.

The sad fact is that the Federal Government aids and abets this relocation process. It grants an antitrust broadcast exemption that makes franchises worth hundreds of millions of dollars and makes the leagues possible and extraordinarily profitable. The NFL alone in the most recent round of contract negotiations netted \$17.5 billion.

Still there is no stability for the American fan, and they continue to pay more for tickets, more for parking, more for taxes, more for seat licenses, more for concessions that make it less affordable, less comfortable for the community and ever more lucrative for the few who profit.

It does not have to be this way. I have introduced the Give Fans a Chance Act which would require that leagues follow their stated rules on relocation and consider the community impact, actually involve the community in the decisionmaking process.

My legislation would give local communities the opportunity, after this analysis takes place, to actually match a bid for a franchise that might otherwise be relocated. And, most important, it would not allow these professional sports leagues to have artificial restraints on who can own a team.

The NFL, for example, has decreed there will be no more Green Bay Packers style community ownership. One has got to be a billionaire. Green Bay, Wisconsin, one thirty-fourth the size of Los Angeles, has one of the most suc-

cessful franchises in professional sports, and it is owned by 1,950 shareholders. Little Green Bay, Wisconsin, does not have to worry that when they invest millions of dollars in their facilities, that somehow an owner is going to decide to relocate elsewhere, and it has made a profound difference in that community.

The NFL and others argue that Green Bay is an aberration, a special case, that it cannot be replicated anywhere else, that people in other communities are not smart enough to figure this out. I disagree. I do not think Green Bay, as unique as that community is, is an aberration and a special case, and I think we ought to at least give other fans the same chance.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Give Fans a Chance legislation. I strongly urge long-suffering sports fans to lend their voice. If the American people are heard, truly we will give the sports fans a chance.

#### DECENNIAL CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of the upcoming decennial census which is just 13 months away. A year from next month, the forms will be going into the mail, tens of millions of them, all across America to count everyone. We need to do the best job we can, without politics, to get everyone counted.

Sadly, this administration has proposed a historic change. Because for every census since Thomas Jefferson in 1790, we have attempted to count everyone, but this administration has wanted to use polling techniques in order to say, "We don't need to count everyone. Let me just guesstimate at the numbers."

Fortunately last week the Supreme Court finally said, "No, you've got to count." The actual enumeration as stated in the Constitution is the law of the land. We need to count everyone for purposes of apportionment.

Sadly, this administration does not want to listen to the courts. They have got this idea now that they want to have a two-number census. What they are proposing is, we will have a set of numbers provided that the Supreme Court says are the legal numbers, and then the Clinton Administration wants to adjust these numbers and have a Clinton set of numbers. And so for every city and county in this great country we are going to have two sets of numbers, a Supreme Court set of numbers and the Clinton numbers.

We have enough cynicism and doubts in this country, and we need to have trust in our government. We do not need to create the confusion of two sets of numbers. The Census Bureau and the professionals at least in the past have argued against two sets of numbers. Hopefully they will stand by their prin-

ciples and say two sets of numbers are wrong, because we can only have one set of numbers. It is what is required by law and that is what the Supreme Court has ruled.

To do the census is difficult work. It is hard work. It costs a lot of money. Because we only do it once every 10 years, we need to concentrate all of our efforts into doing the best census possible. Because if we try to do two censuses, we are going to have two failed censuses, and that is wrong for America.

Can my colleagues just imagine every community having the choice of two numbers? This is a lawyer's dream. In fact, Justice Scalia at the oral arguments of the Supreme Court last November said, "Are we going to be creating a whole new area of census law?" That is exactly what could happen with a two-number census.

What we need to do, as I proposed last week to the Conference of Mayors, is a proposal to put all the resources we can and all the actions that this Congress can provide to get the best census possible. Everybody should be counted. I have proposed a series of provisions, from increasing the amount of paid advertising from \$100 million to \$400 million, from the idea that we will need another 100,000 more enumerators to get the job done right.

Yes, we are proposing to increase the spending on the census in order to get the best census possible that is trusted by the American people. Why not use AmeriCorps? I have doubts that we need AmeriCorps, but a Republican advocating using AmeriCorps for the census I think is rather significant.

Something else that we are proposing is something called the post-census local review. I think almost every mayor and county commissioner in this country will support this. It was used in the 1990 census. What it is is that after the Census Bureau gets their numbers, they are sent back to the local communities to evaluate, to in effect conduct an audit and to see if there is something missing. If there is, they can raise the issue with the Census Bureau and then the Census Bureau will adjust the numbers if those challenges and questions are correctly adjusted.

Why not, to build trust in our census, allow communities a chance to review the numbers before they become official? What are the Census Bureau and the administration afraid of, trusting our local officials like we did in 1990 to have a chance to review it before it becomes official?

I also propose that we work together with the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) on legislation to make it available, for example, that welfare workers or retired officers have the right without losing their benefits to work temporarily for the Census Bureau. We want to get local people involved in the Census.

I have held hearings of the Subcommittee on Census in Miami, and